

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

**Glynn Davis, Eugene Brombolich,
and Eugene Forneris, individually and
on behalf of all those similarly situated,**

Plaintiffs,

and

**Juanita Hammond, on behalf of
herself and all others similarly situated,**

Plaintiff-Intervenor,

v.

Solutia, Inc. Employees' Pension Plan,

Defendant.

Case No. 05-00736-DRH

ORDER

HERNDON, District Judge:

Before the Court is Plaintiff-Intervenor Juanita Hammond's ("Hammond") Motion to Seal *In Camera* Her Response to Davis Plaintiffs' Motion for Appointment of Interim Class Counsel (Doc. 69). In the April 27, 2006 Order (Doc. 68) granting Hammond's Motion to Intervene, the Court directed Hammond to file her Response to the *Davis* Plaintiffs' Motion for Appointment of Interim Class Counsel by May 4, 2006. As part of that Response, Hammond has announced her intention to adopt the interim counsel Reply filed in *Hammond v. Solutia, Inc. Employees' Pension Plan*, No. 3:06-cv-00139-DRH (*Hammond* Docs. 40-41). The

other parties in this case have not opposed this Motion.

The Court allowed Hammond to file portions of that Reply *in camera* in the *Hammond* case (*Hammond* Doc. 39), for stated reasons of protecting certain attorney work product information. For the reasons explained in the Order granting Hammond leave to file portions of her interim counsel Reply *in camera* in her own case, the Court **GRANTS** Hammond's Motion to submit that Reply on the same terms in this case as part of her Response to the *Davis* Plaintiffs' Motion to Appoint Interim Class Counsel (Doc. 55) in the instant matter.¹

Hammond also filed a Motion seeking an extension of time to file her Response because the Court had not yet ruled upon whether it could be filed *in camera* (Doc. 71). The Court also **GRANTS** this Motion for Extension of Time (Doc. 71). As such, Hammond has until **Tuesday, May 9, 2006**, to file her Response to the *Davis* Plaintiffs' Motion to Appoint Interim Class Counsel (Doc. 55).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 5th day of May, 2006.

/s/ David RHerndon
United States District Judge

¹ In other words, Plaintiff should file two Responses – one should be filed under seal/*in camera*, and the other should be filed normally, with the privileged information portions redacted, as done in the *Hammond* case.